

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

KEMYA C. BRYANT,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 1:14-cv-735

Barrett, J.  
Bowman, M.J.

TIME WARNER CABLE INC., et al.,

Defendants.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

On January 9, 2015, the parties were ordered to appear before the court, by phone, for a status conference on January 23, 2015. (See 1/9/15 Docket Minute Entry). Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, did not call-in for the January 23, 2015 telephone conference. (See 1/23/15 Docket Minute Entry). Thereafter, the matter was set for another telephone status conference on March 3, 2015. (Doc. 16). Plaintiff again failed to appear and did not call in to the conference. (See 3/3/15 Docket Minute Entry).

Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this matter and to obey an Order of the Court warrants dismissal of this case pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b). See *Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109–10 (6th Cir.1991). District courts have the power to *sua sponte* dismiss civil actions for want of prosecution to “manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962). See also *Jourdan*, 951 F.2d at 109. Though plaintiff is proceeding pro se, as stated by the Supreme Court, “we have never suggested that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should be interpreted so

as to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel.” *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993).

Accordingly, the undersigned **RECOMMENDS** that Plaintiff's case be **DISMISSED** for want of prosecution and for failure to obey a Court Order; and that this case be **CLOSED**.

s/ Stephanie K. Bowman  
Stephanie K. Bowman  
United States Magistrate Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

KEMYA C. BRYABNT,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

TIME WARNER CABLE INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:14-cv-735

Barrett, J.  
Bowman, M.J.

**NOTICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to this Report & Recommendation ("R&R") within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. That period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion by either side for an extension of time. All objections shall specify the portion(s) of the R&R objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. A party shall respond to an opponent's objections within **FOURTEEN DAYS** after being served with a copy of those objections. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).